

1 ASCENSION LAW GROUP
2 PAMELA TSAO(266734)
3 2030 E. 4th Street
4 Suite 205
5 Santa Ana, CA 92705
6 PH: 714.783.4220
7 FAX: 888.505.1033
8 Pamela.Tsao@ascensionlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff HOANG MINH LE

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 HOANG MINH LE, an individual

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 ROBKAT HARBOR LLC, a limited
15 liability company; and DOES 1 through
16 10,

17 Defendants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Case No.: 5:15-cv-1628

VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR

- (1) **PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND
DAMAGES**
- (2) **VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (CALIFORNIA
CIVIL CODE §§ 51, 52);**
- (3) **VIOLATIONS OF THE
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES
ACT OF 1990**

I.
SUMMARY

1
2
3 **1.** This is a civil rights action by plaintiff Hoang Minh Le (“Plaintiff”) for
4 discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land,
5 development, and/or surrounding business complex known as: 2330 S. Harbor Blvd.,
6 Anaheim CA 92802 (the “Property”), from which the business “Del Taco Fast Food”
7 operates.

8 **2.** Plaintiff seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney’s fees
9 and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§
10 12101, et seq.) and related California statutes against defendant, the tenant and/or
11 owner of the Property, ROBRAT HARBOR, LLC.(“Defendant”).

12 **II.**
13 **JURISDICTION**

14 **3.** This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343
15 for ADA claims.

16 **4.** Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California
17 law – arising from the same nucleus of operative facts – is predicated on 28 U.S.C §
18 1367.

19 **5.** Plaintiff’s claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

20 **III.**
21 **VENUE**

22 **6.** All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the
23 United States District Court, Central District of California, and venue is invoked
24 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

25 **IV.**
26 **PARTIES**

27 **7.** Defendant is, or was at the time of the incident, the owners, operators,
28 lessors and/or lessees of the Property, and consist of a person (or persons), firm,

1 as his wheelchair rolls.

- 2 **b.** The access aisles accompanying the accessible parking are not
3 completely flat. There are curb ramps that protrude into the access aisles.
4 This protrusion into the access aisle makes it difficult for Plaintiff to
5 unload/transfer out of his vehicle.
6 **c.** Ramps do not have appropriate railings. Without proper railings it makes
7 it difficult for Plaintiff to ascend up the ramp as it can cause Plaintiff to
8 roll back.

9 **12.** These barriers to access are listed without prejudice to plaintiff citing
10 additional barriers to access after inspection by plaintiff's access consultant, per the
11 9th Circuits standing standards under *Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.* 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir.
12 2008). These barriers prevented Plaintiff from enjoying full and equal access to the
13 Property.

14 **13.** Plaintiff was deterred from visiting the Property as a result of the
15 accessible barriers he encountered. He continues to be deterred from visiting the
16 Property because of the future threats of injury created by these barriers.

17 **14.** Defendant knew that these elements and areas of the Property were
18 inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to the
19 physically disabled. Moreover, Defendant has the financial resources to remove these
20 barriers from the Property (without much difficult or expense), and make the Property
21 accessible to the physically disabled. To date, however, the Defendant refuses to
22 remove those barriers.

23 **15.** At all relevant times, Defendant has possessed and enjoyed sufficient
24 control and authority to modify the Property to remove impediments to wheelchair
25 access and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility
26 Guidelines and Title 24 regulations. Defendant has not removed such impediments
27 and has not modified the Property to conform to accessibility standards.
28

VI.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR
DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC FACILITIES IN A
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION**

**(California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seq. California Civil Code § 54 et
seq.,.)**

16. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 for this claim.

17. Plaintiff is unable to use public facilities on a “full and equal” basis unless each such facility is in compliance with the provisions of California Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 et seq. Plaintiff is a member of that portion of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of Health & Safety Code §§ 19955, et seq.

18. Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 and 19955.5 were enacted “[t]o ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code.” On information and belief, the provisions of both Healthy and Safety Code §§ 19955 and 19955.5 apply to the Property. The code relating to such public accommodations also require that “when sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients, or employees ..., they shall be made available for persons with disabilities.” Title 24, California Code of Regulations, formerly known as the California Administrative Code, was in effect at the time of each alteration which, on information and belief, occurred at such public facility since July 1, 1982, thus requiring access complying with the specifications of Title 24 whenever each such “alteration, structural repair or addition” was carried out. On information and belief, Defendant, and/or their predecessors in interest carried out alterations, structural repairs, or additions to the building during the period Title 24 has been in effect. On information and belief, alterations, structural repairs, or additions which triggered access requirements also occurred between July 1, 1970 and July 1, 1982

1 and required access pursuant to the A.S.A. (American Standards Association)
 2 Regulations then in effect pursuant to the incorporated provisions of California
 3 Government Code §§ 4450 et seq. and California Health & Safety Code §§ 19959.

4 **19.** Title III of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be
 5 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use)
 6 of goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person
 7 who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. §
 8 12182(a).

9 **20.** Further, each and every violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act
 10 of 1990 (as pled in the Second Cause of Action, *infra*, the contents of which are repled
 11 and incorporated herein, word for word, as if separately repled), also constitutes a
 12 separate and distinct violation of California Civil Code § 54(c), thus independently
 13 justifying an award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law,
 14 including but not limited to Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3.

15 **21.** Further, each and every violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act
 16 of 1990 (as pled in the Second Cause of Action herein below, the contents of which
 17 are repled and incorporated herein, word for word, as if separately repled), also
 18 constitutes a separate and distinct violation of Civil Code § 54.1(d), thus
 19 independently justifying an award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to
 20 California law, including but not limited to Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3.

21 **VII.**

22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LAW** 23 **INCLUDING: THE UNRUH ACT, CIVIL CODE §§ 51, 52 AND THE** 24 **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AS INCORPORATED BY CIVIL** 25 **CODE SECTION 51(f)**

26 **22.** Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through
 27 19 for this claim and incorporates them herein.

28 **23.** At all times relevant to this complaint, California Civil Code § 51 has

1 provided that physically disabled persons are free and equal citizens of the state,
2 regardless of disability or medical condition:

3 All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and
4 no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national
5 origin, disability, or medical condition are entitled to the full and
6 equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services
7 in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever. Cal. Civ.
8 Code § 51(b).

9 **24.** California Civil Code § 52 provides that the discrimination by Defendant
10 against Plaintiff on the basis of his disabilities constitutes a violation of the anti-
11 discrimination provisions of §§ 51 and 52.

12 **25.** Defendant's discrimination constitutes a separate and distinct violation of
13 California Civil Code § 52 which provides that:

14 Whoever denies, aids or incites a denial, or makes any discrimination
15 or distinction contrary to section 51, 51.5 or 51.6 is liable for each and
16 every offense for the actual damages, and any amount that may be
17 determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a
18 maximum of three times the amount of actual damage but in no case
19 less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000) and any attorney's fees that
20 may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any
21 person denied the rights provided in Section 51, 51.5 or 51.6.

22 **26.** Any violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (as pled in
23 the Third Cause of Action) constitutes a violation of California Civil Code § 51(f)
24 thus independently justifying an award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to
25 California law. Per § 51(f), "[a] violation of the right of any individual under the
26 Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ... shall also constitute a violation of this
27 section."

28 **27.** The actions and omissions of Defendant as herein alleged constitute a

denial of access to and use of the described public facilities by physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52. As a proximate result of Defendant's action and omissions Defendant has discriminated against plaintiffs in a violation of Civil Code §§ 51 and 51.

VIII.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (42 USC §§ 12101 *et seq.*)

28. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 25 for this claim and incorporates them herein.

29. As part of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), Congress passed "Title III – Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities." 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* The Property is one of the "private entities" which are considered "public accommodations" for purposes of this title, which includes any "restaurant, bar, or other sales or rental establishment serving food or drink." § 301(7)(B).

30. The ADA states that "[n]o individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation." 42 U.S.C. § 12182.

31. The acts and omissions of Defendant set forth herein were in violation of plaintiff's rights under the ADA and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 CFR Part 36 *et seq.*

32. The removal of each of the barriers complained of by plaintiff as hereinabove alleged, were at all times herein mentioned "readily achievable" under the standards §§ 301 and 302 of the ADA. As noted hereinabove, removal of each and every one of the architectural barriers complained of herein were also required under California law. Further, on information and belief, alterations, structural repairs or

1 additions since January 26, 1993 have also independently triggered requirements for
2 removal of barriers to access for disabled persons per § 303 of the ADA. In the event
3 that removal of any barrier is found to be "not readily achievable," Defendant still
4 violated the ADA, per § 302(b)(2)(A)(v) by failing to provide all goods, services,
5 privileges, advantages and accommodations through alternative methods that were
6 readily achievable.

7 **33.** On information and belief, as of the date of plaintiffs encounter at the
8 subject premises and as of the filing of this Complaint, the premises have denied and
9 continue to deny full and equal access to plaintiff and to other disabled persons,
10 including wheelchair users, in other respects, which violate plaintiff's rights to full and
11 equal access and which discriminate against plaintiff on the basis of his disability,
12 thus wrongfully denying to plaintiff the full and equal enjoyment of the goods,
13 services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations, in violation of §§ 302
14 and 303 of the ADA. 42 USC §§ 12182 and 12183.

15 **34.** On information and belief, Defendant has continued to violate the law
16 and deny the rights of plaintiff and other disabled persons to access this public
17 accommodation since on or before plaintiff's encounters, as previously noted.
18 Pursuant to the ADA, § 308, 42 USC 12188 *et seq.*, plaintiff is entitled to the remedies
19 and procedures set forth in § 204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC 2000(a)-
20 3(a), as plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in
21 violation of the ADA or has reasonable grounds for believing that he is about to be
22 subjected to discrimination. Pursuant to § 308(a)(2), "In cases of violations of § 302(b)
23)(2)(A)(iv) and § 303(a) ... injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to
24 make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to
25 the extent required by this title."

26 **35.** Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to remedies set forth in § 204(a) of the Civil
27 Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC 2000(a)-3(a), and pursuant to Federal Regulations
28 adopted to implement the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Plaintiff is a

1 qualified disabled person for purposes of § 308(a) of the ADA who is being subjected
2 to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of Title III and who has
3 reasonable grounds for believing he will be subjected to such discrimination each time
4 that he may attempt to use the property and premises.
5

6
7 **PRAYER**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief
9 as follows:

10 1. Issue a preliminary and permanent injunction directing Defendant as current
11 owners, operators, lessors, and/or lessees of the property and premises to modify the
12 above described property and premises and related facilities so that each provides full
13 and equal access to all persons, including but not limited to persons with physical
14 disabilities who use wheelchairs, and issue a preliminary and permanent injunction
15 directing Defendant to provide and maintain facilities usable by plaintiff and similarly
16 situated persons with disabilities, and which provide full and equal access, as required
17 by law, including appropriate changes in policy;

18 2. Retain jurisdiction over the Defendant until such time as the Court is satisfied
19 that Defendant's unlawful policies, practices, acts and omissions, and maintenance of
20 inaccessible public facilities as complained of herein no longer occur, and can not
21 recur;

22 3. Award to Plaintiff all appropriate damages, including but not limited to
23 statutory damages, general damages and treble damages in amounts within the
24 jurisdiction of this Court, all according to proof;

25 4. Award to Plaintiff all reasonable statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses, and
26 costs of this proceeding as provided by law;
27

28 ///

1 5. Award to plaintiff prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil 17 Code§
2 3291;

3 6. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.
4
5
6
7

8 ASCENSION LAW GROUP, PC

9 DATE: November 19, 2015

10 /s/ Pamela Tsao

11 Pamela Tsao, attorney for Plaintiff

12 HOANG MINH LE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**
6

7 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury is permitted.
8

9 ASCENSION LAW GROUP, PC

10 DATE: August 26, 2015

11 /s/ Pamela Tsao

12 Pamela Tsao, attorney for Plaintiff

13 HOANG MINH LE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28